



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,780	11/26/2001	Gerard Scott Freeland	AZON3ADIV/dln	5821

7590

05/20/2003

THE FIRM OF HUESCHEN AND SAGE
500 Columbia Plaza
350 East Michigan Ave.
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

EXAMINER

SERGEANT, RABON A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

S

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/992,780

Applicant(s)

FREELAND ET AL.

Examiner

Rabon A Sergent

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claims 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants have failed to provide support for the claimed viscosity of 300-50000 cps at room temperature for the prepolymer. The claimed viscosity pertains to the curative, according to page 10 of the specification. Despite applicants' response, the claimed viscosity range corresponds to the viscosity of the curative, not the prepolymer. All instances set forth by applicants which encompass this range pertain to the curative.

2. Claims 34-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

While the basis for the weight percent contents of the prepolymer is clear, the basis for the weight percent contents of the curative remain unclear. It is unclear if the weight percents are based on the total weight of the curative, the combined weight of the prepolymer and curative, the weight of the prepolymer, or the weight of a constituent. It does not necessarily follow that the basis is the prepolymer, since the curative contains additional components.

3. Claims 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had

Art Unit: 1711

possession of the claimed invention. Applicants have failed to indicate where support exists for the claimed basis for the weight percents of the curative component.

4. Claims 38, 39, and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The subject matter of the dependent claims fails to further limit claim 34, because claim 34 states that the prepolymer and curative are used in stoichiometric amounts; however, the dependent claims specify that a stoichiometric excess of the prepolymer is used with the curative.

5. Claims 34, 35, and 37-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compositions wherein the viscosity of prepolymer (P) corresponds to the value given within the specification at page 2, does not reasonably provide enablement for compositions wherein the prepolymer is not governed by the aforementioned viscosity value. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants have failed to provide adequate enablement for the production and use of prepolymers which do not have the aforementioned viscosity characteristic, and applicants have failed to provide guidance with respect to the modification of parameters that would permit the production of viable prepolymers that differ from those specifically disclosed. A key facet of

Art Unit: 1711

applicants' invention resides in the fact that the prepolymer is liquid at room temperature;
however, applicants' claims fail to recite this feature.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone
number (703) 308-2982.


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

R. Sergent
May 19, 2003